

HERALD AND JOURNAL.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1844.

DR. BOND ON COMPROMISE.

We give this week Dr. Bond's reply to Br. Adams on compromise. Our readers will note three points in it. First, The Dr. represents that he has been egregiously misunderstood—that he did not concur in the various plans of compromise proposed, but entertained an essentially different one.

Second, He states his plan—In the Christian Advocate and Journal of the 23d of October, headed, "The Compromise," we did not propose to expunge any thing from the Discipline; and we do not hesitate to say, that we would not willingly part with a single word of the tenth section.

Neither did we propose to "take away" the right of travelling preachers to appeal to the General Conference in cases relating to slavery. We cannot see how the right of appeal, in any case, could be safely abridged, even if the constitution allowed it.

Having been compelled to disavow what we did not propose, we proceed to state and to justify what is really contained in our propositions.

The first proposition was, that it should be agreed that the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church should neither be slaveholders, nor abolitionists in the modern acceptance of the term. The second was, that the General Conference should commit to the several Annual Conferences the power to make such regulations, in respect to slavery, as in the circumstances in which they may be placed may be found practicable and proper. But we did not mean that these Conferences should be allowed to contravene by their rules any existing rule of the Discipline; but to act under them, and with a view to effect the objects proposed in the tenth section of the Discipline, as well as the General Rule on the same subject.

Third, He demands a certain explanation from New England.

We abridge the Dr.'s language, but our readers can refer to his article in another column. We submit some remarks on each of these items, premising that the italics are our own.

1. In respect to the first, it is due to our old friend that something should be said in excuse of the fact that we of the East, and we doubt not the whole church North, South, East and West, have been caught napping in the case—misapprehending entirely his position. Such a remarkable phenomenon certainly should be accounted for. We account for it on the following considerations.

1. All the plans which had yet been published proposed to abolish all our anti-slavery legislation and transfer all power of legislation on slavery to the Annual Conferences. In reference to one of these, our brother editor devoutly shouted, "Glory to God, there is still hope," and stating no exception, though he did not endorse it, we were all, of course, prepared to misunderstand him subsequently.

2. The manner in which he introduced his article headed "Compromise," Oct. 2, led us still further astray. As we are all guilty of this strange blunder, and as it is always a pleasure to find a mitigation of our faults, we beg our readers to refer to the Advocate of that date. They will find that two communications precede the Dr.'s article; one a "Proposition for Compromise," signed John T. Baskerville; the other, "Proceedings of the Shelbyville Station," Ky.—Now the first of these contained the following terms of compromise:—

Article 1st. All laws and disciplinary regulations on slavery to be repealed. The General Conference shall pass no law or disciplinary regulation, or have any action whatever, either original—from appeals or petitions on slavery.

Article 2d. The Annual Conferences may pass laws and disciplinary regulations on slavery for their government severally and in all cases their decision shall be final.

And the Shelbyville Report, of which the Dr. editorially said that it puts a "favorable appearance upon the prospect of compromise, peace and union," contained the following:—

Resolved, That we are in favor of striking from the Discipline the rule relative to slavery, and of inserting in its stead one that will give each Annual Conference the authority to make such regulations as it may deem expedient upon that subject, in accordance with the constitution and laws of the state.

Now these communications were certainly explicit, and they apparently led to the Dr.'s editorial, and he commences it by introducing them, and by stating that "taken together they leave the friends of union something to hope, though there is yet much to fear." With these plans thus introduced, and with no essentially different plan ever yet broached, the Dr. proceeds to reason on two propositions, the substance of all the plans yet propounded, viz., 1. That no slaveholder or abolitionist should be admitted to the Episcopacy. 2. That we should commit, to use his own language, "to the several Annual Conferences the exclusive authority to take such measures from time to time as their circumstances and the leadings of Providence may suggest for the amelioration and final extinction of slavery." We give the following paragraph:—

On the part of the non-slaveholding Conferences, we should suppose that upon a calm review of all the difficulties which have arisen in the history of the church in regard to slavery, and the utter impossibility of framing any general rules of Discipline on the subject which, under the laws of the slaveholding states, could be enforced without doing great injury to the slaves themselves, they would see and acknowledge the propriety of committing to the several Annual Conferences the exclusive authority to take such measures, from time to time, as their circumstances and the leadings of Providence may suggest for the amelioration and final extinction of slavery. It is utterly impossible for the General Conference to adapt rules to local circumstances, which vary essentially in different Conferences, and which are perpetually undergoing changes from the acts of state legislatures, over which we, as a church, have no control. In proof of this we may conclusively point to the vacillating and even inconsistent legislation of the body, in her acts and doings in relation to slavery from the first organization of the church up to the last act which appears in our Book of Discipline. Compare her legislative action on this subject with the steady, clear, and consistent provisions in relation to any other subject of church discipline, and it must be evident that there have been obstacles and impediments in the way of every General Conference which no human sagacity can surmount or remove.

Now in this language the Dr. might well have meant (in opposition to the plans which gave him so much encouragement) that this "exclusive authority" of the Annual Conferences to "take such measures" "against slavery," as "circumstances" and "Providence" may suggest, should not be accompanied with the repeal of the authority of the General Conference as expressed in its present legislation, nor in any wise contravene it. Yet could the church have so understood him? That's the question. Forasmuch as he did not give the slightest intimation of this wide difference between himself and his correspondents, but reasoned in favor of their general proposition, we could hardly fail of course to misapprehend him. Now then, with these facts before us, viz., that no plan had ever been broached but with the *sine qua non* that all legislation on slavery should be transferred to the Annual Conferences, and that the Dr. introduces and comments with hope on two articles proposing this *sine qua non*, and proceeds to reason in favor of committing "exclusive authority," &c., to the Annual Conferences, without an intimation that he used this rather strong phrase in an entirely different sense from the others, will it not be considered the whole church somewhat excusable though it has so strangely blundered?

3. The Dr. must excuse his brethren in not conceiving his private plan, from another consideration, viz., that it was perfectly inconceivable. The plans before proposed provided to abolish all our present

legislation, &c. &c., and yet they had been repelled by all the papers and leading men of the South with out mercy. How then could we have supposed that in advocating compromise with some "hope" at least, he had reference to a plan which upsets all the others, and is infinitely further from accommodating the South? If his plan had reference merely to the future good understanding of the East, and those brethren on the border who, after the division, may remain with the North, as he now wishes it substantially to apply, we might have supposed the project conceivable; but this point had not then been thought of; the Dr. and all of us were writing merely of compromise with the South, and how the church could have conceived of his entertaining such a perfectly hopeless scheme, or how he could have conceived it, even with his acknowledged abilities, is certainly a grave problem.

4. But further and stronger yet, we apologize for this misapprehension of the whole church by the consideration of the *express language* of our brother editor. Not only did he argue for the general propositions of his correspondents, without intimating his immense divergence from them, but his whole language was such as to hardly admit the supposition that he meant what he now proposes. The reader will perceive that he now proposes to retain all our present legislation and the jurisdiction of the General Conference over it, that is, that the General Conference shall have authority to enforce its present legislation, turning out members for trafficking in slaves, according to the "General Rule;" secondly, turning them out of "official stations" for not emancipating them when the laws will admit it, &c., thirdly, turning preachers out of the ministerial office for the same neglect in similar circumstances, and fourthly, receiving appeals in cases relating to slavery. Now when the Doctor, two months ago, proposed to "commit to the several Annual Conferences the exclusive authority," &c., how could we have supposed that he meant that all the present "authority" of the General Conference should be retained? When he two months ago declared himself thus—"Upon the whole we do not see what serious objection could be urged against committing the whole subject of slavery, with all its responsibilities, to the annual Conferences," and this too in connection with the plans we have mentioned and without a word of dissent from them, we cannot see "for the life of us" how the church could have dreamed that he meant, nevertheless, that the "whole subject" should not be thus committed, but that all our present provisions should be retained; that "all its responsibilities" should not be thus transferred, but that the General Conference should retain the responsibility of executing its present laws and of trying appeals, &c., on slavery. When he, at that time, said, "Let all that relates to slavery and slaveholding be committed to the annual Conferences, who alone can adapt rules to their several circumstances in the premises," how could we suppose that this "all" did not mean "all," but that the General Conference was still to retain laws turning out official members from their offices, degrading preachers from the ministry, and examining and determining cases of appeal connected with slavery? Or if even we could get over this language, yet what could we do when we read in that same article this phrase: "The northern churches should agree to this, first, because they will no longer be responsible, in part or in whole, for evils which they cannot remedy by church action." Now it was certainly more than common minds could determine that the phrase, "no longer responsible in part or in whole," meant that we were still to be responsible for the execution of all our present legislation, General Rule, tenth section, appeals and all. When he gave as a reason for this transference "the utter impossibility of framing any general rules of discipline on the subject which, under the laws of the slaveholding states, could be enforced," &c., we were certainly excusable for blundering into the supposition that he did not mean we should retain all our present "general rules of Discipline on the subject." Were we not? When he said that "in proof of this we may conclusively point to the vacillating and even inconsistent legislation of this body in her acts and doings in relation to slavery, from the first organization of the church up to the last act which appears in our Book of Discipline," we were certainly in our simplicity very liable to suppose that he included, in the sweeping condemnation, our existing legislation. And if the phrase, "up to the last act," afforded us a momentary hope, it was extinguished when we read again this decisive phrase: "The vacillating and disastrous legislation which is exhibited by the history of the General Conference action, as we find it in the different editions of our Book of Discipline from 1784 to the present time." And when he declares that, "upon the whole, it would seem that the basis of a safe and righteous compromise has been laid down," we did (and we make humble confession of our fault) really suppose that the phrase "has been laid down" referred to the only articles which had yet appeared on the subject, all of which proposed to transfer every thing that related to slavery to the Annual Conferences. Now we hope the public, in mitigation of our blunder, will consider that the Doctor had expressed his gratitude and hope in view of plans proposing to abolish our present legislation on slavery; that he introduced, with his article on compromise, two communications, proposing the same thing "out and out," and proceeded to reason in favor of the general proposition to commit to the annual Conferences, "the whole subject of slavery with all its responsibilities," "all that relates to slavery and slaveholding," so that "the northern churches will no longer be responsible in part or in whole for evils, without a single qualification, showing that his meaning was different from theirs, without a word of dissent, notwithstanding he differed from them in a manner that all will admit would have thrown their authors into paroxysms of despair; that demonstrations had been given in the South, sufficient to assure all thinking men that the plan he now advances would not have been received with the respect due even to a blunder; and that under all these circumstances the general phraseology of his article was such as we have abundantly quoted. Put all these considerations together, and will not the Doctor and the public admit that though the misapprehension was a serious one, yet the church, (for the whole church has made it), can plead much in extenuation, and that even the excellent Charles Adams may feel that he can still hold up his head, and does not indubitably need the Doctor's generous assertions that he does not suspect him of "intentional misrepresentation," nor the assurances he gives the public that Br. Adams is sincere and candid and pious, though "ardent in his feelings" and "too excited by controversy" to "read calmly and dispassionately" the Doctor's propositions.

Take an illustration of our difficulty. The Doctor and ourselves, say, are walking in Chatham St., when we are carried by the current into Tammany Hall. Here is raging, and has been raging for weeks, a discussion proposing to repeal all the national tariff laws, and commit to South Carolina and her sister nullifiers the whole legislation of that subject for ever. No other project than this has been once mentioned. After several speeches the Doctor catches the patriotic fire, mounts the rostrum, congratulates the assembly on the hopefulness of the case, commends by name the two preceding speakers, who were thorough-going in the project, and then, in a long speech, proceeds to argue in favor of committing to the South the "whole subject of the tariff, with all its responsibilities," that the North might be "no longer responsible for it in whole or in part," denouncing all our past legislation on it as "vacillating and disastrous," and this too without a single intimation that he differed in the use of these terms from the other orators. The friends of the project throw up their hats and hurra for the Doctor as on their side. Meanwhile our patriotism takes an

opposite course. We denounce this new project in the papers, the public denounce it east and west, — when, lo, the Doctor calls a public assembly, assures them that he has been misunderstood, that, by transferring the "whole laws on it," he meant we should keep all our present laws on it, that "all its responsibilities" would not mean "all," but we were to retain our present ones, &c. &c. Now under these circumstances would not the assembly vote us somewhat excusable, especially if the Doctor should assure them that we were "sincere" though "ardent," and he had reason to believe we did not intentionally misrepresent him?

We have not made these apologetic remarks for Br. Adams—he is well able to answer for himself—but for the whole church, and particularly for our humble self; for all our long inflictions on our readers lately, in respect to compromise, arose from the Doctor's supposed position. While his correspondents alone advocated compromise, we felt assured that the obvious impracticability of the design would obviate danger; but when the official organ committed itself, we thought it time to prepare for trouble.

As we conclude this part of our article, a delegate to the late General Conference, now at our elbow, (our good brother King), who is deeply interested in these questions, and whose advice will be valued in New England, wishes us, in his name, to insert the following admonition: That as there are many unfortunate wights in New England, who foolishly imagine that they have been cruelly abused heretofore by the Dr., and as they might in their simplicity suppose he is himself caught napping in this instance, nay, that finding the church repelling his former plan of compromise as inadmissible if not disgraceful, he is found retreating under false colors, and therefore they have a fine opportunity of retaliating on him,—that they would do well to restrain themselves, for he still holds in hand that terrible pen they so well remember, and can vindicate himself; and that even those brave spirits from whom abuse rolls like water from a duck's back, should be careful, for though if the Dr. were a political editor, he might have thus accommodatedly made the best of a bad cause; or if, even as a religious editor, he were accustomed to use crafty tactics, deep management and shrewd evasion, he might have done so in this case; yet, as he is known to be neither a political editor, nor given to ingenious management, but is famous for dignified candor towards his antagonists, and that childlike frankness taught in the gospel, the public may find it difficult to credit the charges of such resentful youths; for it will clearly appear to the public that any man who can creep out through so small a hole must be of very small dimensions, unless his substance be like that of Indian rubber, great only by stretching, and small by shrinking to its natural magnitude; and as satire is allowable chiefly against those who themselves abuse it, and as the Dr. is known never to have abused it, any such severe resentments may only command for him the public sympathies, and bring terrible maledictions on the heads of all offenders. Beware!

Let us now briefly look at other points.

Second. In respect to his plan, though we decline it, still we like it better than any other yet offered; for notwithstanding the Doctor proposed to commit the "whole subject of slavery, with all its responsibilities," to the annual Conferences, relieving the "Northern churches of all responsibility, in part and in whole," yet it will be perceived that he proposes nevertheless that we retain the responsibility of all our present rules and laws, expelling slave buyers and sellers, deposing official members, and even preachers, under certain circumstances, and receiving and trying appeals, &c. Thus we should still hold a mighty rod, in *terra*, over slavery. But we must still decline this "plan."

1. Because it is utterly hopeless, and therefore not to be entertained. All the plans previously offered proposed to give up every thing on slavery to the Annual Conferences. But the South had treated them with scorn long before the Doctor's appeared. Pres. Durbin has since offered one much more accommodating to the South than the Doctor's; for while it would retain our present laws, it would nullify entirely the jurisdiction of the General Conference over them. But we know not that this has elicited even a comment from the South. How shall we hope, then, for the Doctor's success? Every man that knows any thing about the South, knows that it would hardly deign even to squint at it. This would be a sufficient reason for declining it without another word, but we go further; and affirm,

2. That the principle upon which he bases it is yet quite undecided. He proposes to restrict the General Conference from any further legislation on slavery, because he thinks it cannot, by *Scriptural* warrant, go further.—It has reached the *ultima ratio*, and it cannot especially "make emancipation of slaves a condition of membership to the slaveholder."

"All that can be objected to our proposition is, then, that we propose to prevent the General Conference from passing in future any other rules on the subject of slavery. But is it not plainly manifest that the General Conference cannot take another step on the subject by *Scriptural* authority, or even without disregarding the lessons of experience?"

Now there is a most respectable body of Christians in the United States, who have always thought and acted differently.—The Friends. One or two other Christian denominations of the land have also adopted this "condition of membership," and the World's Convention at London, including the leading preachers of England, passed resolutions, introduced by the distinguished John Angel James, declaring it the duty of Christian churches to withdraw fellowship from all slaveholders; may our very fathers themselves so legislate,—and changed their ground, not from any new discovery of *Scriptural* light, but from expediency.—It is evident then that this question is yet undecided, to say the least, and the wisdom of no great community would allow it, thus unsettled, to be incorporated among its constitutional principles. Yet for ourselves we have no hesitancy at all in saying, that we do not believe the legal or nominal relation of master to slave to be in all cases sinful, or that it should, in the present circumstances of this country, be made in all cases an objection to church membership. Far from it. We should certainly question the sanity of the man who should so insist. Yet we believe that the principle of slavery is radically, and under all circumstances, sinful, but the relation may exist without the principle. The essence of slavery is the *chattelship principle*, and no man who has in his breast, we will not say religion, but a soul, should tolerate this a moment.

Now though a man may, by local circumstances and laws, be compelled to sustain the nominal relation of slaveholder, yet he need not sustain this immoral *chattelship principle*. He can practically disown it to his slaves and the world. The laws give him the wages of their toil but do not compel him to take it; he can pay them their due; the laws empower him to separate man and wife and to sell them as chattels, but do not compel him to do so. He can denounce the practice as sinful and eschew it. In fine there is no slaveholder in the South who cannot assemble his slaves and declare to them that, though the laws will compel them while in the state to remain under his responsibility, yet he disowns the principle of chattelship in them, relinquishes the right to separate or sell them, will pay them a just return for their labor, and allow them, when they please, to depart to other states and take care of themselves; and the man that does this relinquishes the principle of slavery, which is fundamentally the privation of man's right of property in himself and of his consequent individual responsibility for himself. We go a step further, and say that it is the duty of all southern Christians to take this course,

so far at least as to substantially give up the principle of *chattelship*, and that in so far as they do not take it, in so far as they do not justly compensate the laborer's toil, or do withhold his right of property in himself, in his wife and children, or cut off the right of himself and family to intellectual and moral improvement, in so far as they are guilty before God and must give account in the great and terrible day. We go still a step further, and say that if the Christians of the South should take this course, slavery would soon totter and fall all around them. It is not because they cannot help themselves, but because they inquire not what they can do, that the church and the country are perishing under the evil.

And now it is in this respect that the misunderstood and much denominated principle of "Immediate Emancipation" is advocated. This principle of *chattelship* in man can be and ought to be immediately, at once and for ever, renounced by all men. It is in contravention of the laws of nature, of equity and of revelation, and cannot be entertained. Immediate emancipation does not mean that the slave shall immediately be invested with the right of suffrage, eligibility to office, or any other conventional prerogative; these may be left for municipal regulation, as the greatest good of all may demand.

The man who should demand all these for our three millions of slaves in their present moral and intellectual condition, should be sent to the mad-house. You deny them to your sons under a certain age, and to foreigners within a term of years, but you do not thereby reduce them to slavery. Abolitionists have not stopped to inquire what conventional privileges the slave should have, and what not; they have had a higher sight, they have demanded that you *restore to him the right of property in himself*—and give him the fair play of his natural powers and rights to rise and raise his family as he best can; all other matters they leave to prudential regulation.

Now in view of the diversities of opinion on the subject, is it proper for a great religious community to adopt into its constitution the principle of our brother editor, though he and ourselves may deem the opposite one wrong? Especially, we ask, when there is a sense in which slaveholding is inconsistent with church membership, would it be proper for such a body to say it would never make emancipation a term of membership?

3. Though we might never be disposed to make emancipation a term of membership, yet this is no reason why we should preclude all further legislation on slavery. The Dr. declares that we have gone as far as we can. Now this is a point that we believe would require all the doctors of the land a long time to discriminate and decide. We think there remains quite an indefinite range of legislation before coming on to the question of "terms of membership." We may want, like our fathers, to vary a great deal our present legislation, or make new provisions for its enforcement, or supply a hundred details as slavery changes. And who is willing to commit all this to Annual Conferences which are now contending that the church has no right to do any thing about it—that it belongs to the state alone, and are practically sinking, ministers and people, deeper and deeper into the evil.

3. This plan proposes an innovation extraordinary and anomalous in deliberative bodies. We have now good constitutional restrictions, we have a large and very representative body, and yet propose to bind ourselves by a solemn vow or treaty, or constitutional change, that we will never legislate further on a subject involving Christian morals, and proper for legislation, a subject upon which the opinions of the whole world are undergoing a change, and upon which nearly all men have more or less different opinions! Why this singular proposition? have we refuted the doctrine of safe representative legislation? Or are we, as we should be, compelled now to combat error, and do we wish to stipulate a peace with it?

4. We decline this plan because it must fail of its object—the pacification of our differences. These, from their inherent nature, we believe cannot be reconciled on any plan of compromise.—The present one certainly cannot allay them, for it gives the General Conference jurisdiction over the subject throughout all the range of its present legislation, together with its trial of appeals and its rigorous control over its bishops. Why, at this rate, we could keep the subject constantly in agitation before that body, bring every slaveholder directly up to the Discipline, or require the preachers to enforce the Discipline and turn him out of the church. So far then as it is a *compromise*, it seems to us that the plan is utterly hopeless, and not worth the trouble of a consideration.

Though we like this project better than any yet offered, still the very reasons that commend it to us render it hopeless. We give it up, then, as we do all others, and content simply for *Methodism as it constitutionally is*.

Correspondence.

Education in Ohio.—The General Conference Plan in Ohio Education.—Compromise.—Influence of New England.

Br. Stevens.—Dear Sir:—My address at present is at Athens, Athens Co., the location of one of the Ohio universities. Presuming that your old friend Merriek has heretofore given you a description of its location, endowment, &c., I will not trouble you with these matters, but would just say that this institution is not in a very flourishing condition at present. If one of the state universities were under the patronage of the M. E. Church, in view of our numerical strength, and that laudable zeal which is waking up among preachers and people, on the subject of education, it would be carried forward with efficiency and success. But such has been the sectarian influence, and ostentatious claims of some in being first and best in classical literature, that the Methodists have resolved on building up a university, at Delaware, worthy of our name and numbers. It received a very generous subscription during the last year. Our institutions of learning occupied a large share of attention at our late Conference, and the cause of education received a new impulse.

With other things that came up for deliberation was the recommendation of the General Conference, in reference to the restrictive rule, which we vetoed in good earnest. From the first I saw the proposition of the General Conference I believed it premature, and fraught with evil, and subsequent developments have only strengthened that opinion. It was with these views that I endeavored to oppose the vote of the N. E. Conference to concur; I thought then, and do still, that New England preachers were the last men who should vote for such a measure, having always contended that they were right, and consistent in their action, with the anti-slavery sentiments of the church, and also that the General Conference did right in its action respecting Bishop Andrew and Harding, and that the minority had no just grounds to complain, that their action was unjustifiable and schismatical; therefore it seemed to me that, however the General Conference acted in the premises, that the N. E. Conference were not consistent with their own profession in going for concurrence. The Ohio Conference, though not abolitionist, yet believing the General Conference acted perfectly right, though not with that severity that they might, thought they had no duties to perform to the South in affording the facilities or giving countenance to division.

We believe that if the southern brethren, without any just cause, tear themselves away from the bosom of the church, they alone will be responsible for schism in the body of Christ, and will be justly chargeable with all the consequences which must ensue. The great majority of our Conference will neither invite

secession or compromise a principle of Discipline. We are for the Discipline as it is, without alteration or compromise. It must appear to all that that embarrassment surrounds every plan of compromise, and that insuperable difficulties are in the way of settling this matter, only on the principle of our present Discipline. Either let the General Conference confess to the South and to the world that their action in Bishop A.'s and Harding's cases was extra-judicial, wrong, and oppressive, and that they retract what they have done, and that Bishop A. or any other of the Bishops are at liberty to hold as many slaves as may suit their caprice, or covetousness, or else let it maintain the anti-slavery principles of our church.

This is no time for yielding those principles which we have professed to the world. Should these be compromised, the last relic of liberty, to our thought and judgment, will have been surrendered to our dictators. What have we to claim or expect from our civil relations; the nation has bowed down to southern dictation, and now propositions are made to yield the last right we have in our ecclesiastical relations to protest against slavery; such a paradox in the composition of our democracy and liberty! or to say, thus far shalt thou come and no farther. However pure the intentions of brethren may be in proposing their plans of compromise, for our humble selves we cannot see how a compromise can be brought about without affecting deeper and greater interests than are now at stake.

Rather than compromise or alter our Discipline, let division come; for all the proposed plans as yet, if carried into effect, would only make ten divisions where there is but one. Division in Church and State will come, as sure as there is a God in heaven, and as sure as causes produce their own effects, unless there can be a speedy reform, and the elements of discord be soon removed. But who, from the mass of foreign ignorance and domestic corruption, that is constantly augmenting on our hands, can hope for such a change? For one I despair of any such reform. We are slumbering on a volcano, and ere we are blown into a thousand atoms, or the chains wreathed around us, and we bound to the car of some despot, should we not act the part of a prudent man, who, foreseeing the evil, hideth himself?

If there be no life preserving principle in our institutions, let them fall; the time has arrived, for a test of those principles, and for the wise and sagacious to look about and see what can and must be done. We have read with much interest your editorial on this subject, and the recent address of Br. Adams. Although we have not the least reflection to cast upon the great and good men concerned, yet we think your views of alarm are reasonable, and will roll like thunder peals over the Alleghanies, and along these western valleys, until it shall wake us up to our duty and danger. Never strike the banner that you have hung out upon the walls of Zion, for around it thousands will rally from the east, west, and north, and the south will see that the Discipline, as it is, is the only safe mooring for their shattered bark.

With earnest prayer for the peace of Jerusalem and the prosperity of our Zion I close this communication, already too long, praying that you may be guided by wisdom from on high in your most difficult and responsible duties. Permit me to say to my old friends in New England that I shake hands with them in my heart.

Athens, Ohio, Nov. 27.

OPPOSITION TO DIVISION.

From the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate we copy the following information:—

Rev. G. M. Keese, who is, we think, Presiding Elder of Richmond District, Virginia Conference, is out in the Richmond Christian Advocate against division, and the whole Southern theory of the constitution of the church, and the powers of the Episcopacy. He maintains strongly the correctness of the positions of the late General Conference.

In the Western Christian Advocate, a writer on Cape Girardeau Circuit, Missouri Conference, opposes division, and says:—

"If I have taken a correct view of the subject, there will of necessity be two parties in the western slaveholding states, one adhering to the church as it now exists, and the other, as I conceive, seceders from it; one party sanctioning the ground taken by the majority of the General Conference, 'that it is inexpedient for a bishop to own slaves,' and the other opposing this action."

A meeting of the members of the Methodist E. Church within the bounds of Yelvington Circuit, Kentucky Conference, passed strong resolutions in opposition to division. They say if separation takes place, they wish to remain in the Northern part.

The Rockingham (Va.) District, Baltimore Conference, protests, according to the Christian Advocate and Journal, against the division of the church. The protest is signed by twenty-five travelling preachers, including the Presiding Elder, by fifteen local preachers, and by large majorities of eight Quarterly Conferences, to which it had been submitted. One hundred and eleven members of those Quarterly Conferences voted for the protest, and four were neutral.

Rev. Henry Smith, a venerable and influential member of the Baltimore Conference, who says he has always been a Southern man in his feelings, born in Maryland and raised in Virginia, bears his testimony to the correctness of the positions of the late General Conference on the subject of slavery. According to his showing, the ultra-Southern doctrines are anti-Methodist. He admits that there is no rule in the Discipline which forbids the General Conference to elect a slaveholder to the Episcopacy, or to continue one in office when he becomes connected with slavery. Such a rule, he says, was never thought necessary, but if it had entered into the minds of any of the members of the General Conference of 1808, that such a subject would ever be agitated, or that it would be contended for as a matter of right or necessity, that we should have a slaveholding Episcopacy, such a rule would have been passed by that Conference, with very little, if any, opposition. This opinion is well sustained by facts.

Dr. Elliott has another article against compromise in his last number. He concludes thus:—"On surveying the various proposals for compromise, we see nothing at all tangible. Difficulties meet us at every step. If our present Discipline will not be a basis of settling difficulties, we see no prospect of settling them at all by any half-way process. The South press the necessity of slaveholding bishops; and while this is the case, there can be no settlement, as far as we can discover. Still, we must praise all those excellent brethren who attempt to settle existing differences. The endeavor is a noble one, and we wish them God speed in their attempts at union although our hopes of success are very feeble. We will, however, hope to the end."

CHURCH BURN.—We hope the appeal of Brother Stinchfield in this week's Herald, for the afflicted church at Waterford, will meet with a generous response. The whole amount lost by the fire, \$2200, could readily be raised by small amounts from the different churches of Maine, and these amounts would be grateful tokens of Christian and denominational sympathy, profitable alike to the giver and the receiver. Brethren of the ministry, introduce the case, if possible, at your next Sabbath meetings, and send encouragement to the afflicted flock at Waterford.—You will find the hearts and hands of your people open in such a case.

"CALL THEIR ATTENTION."

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE.

Dear Brethren,—Please read the following from the Discipline, revised edition, p. 123. "It shall be the duty of each Annual Conference to appoint some member within the Conference year in which missionary collections shall be taken within their respective bounds."

And then remember that in accordance with the above the N. E. Conference did appoint the previous month as the time for taking such collections to present year. And did further appoint the subscribers as a committee to call your attention to this business at the time.

Thus, then, the Conference and its committee have done their duty in this matter; it only remains for you to go all and do likewise.

Worcester, Dec. 2.

BISHOP SOULE AND BISHOP ANDREW.

That no doubt may remain respecting Bishop Soule's design in his letter to Bishop Andrew's, we quote the following from the proceedings of the Virginia Conference in the last Richmond Christian Advocate. "This intolerable conduct of Bishop Soule is exciting a sensation. It puts an end to all hope of adjusting with the South. Middle men who were hoping to compromise revolt at it, and are taking their stand."

Br. Lee introduced a resolution inviting Bishop Andrew to preside in the Conference in conjunction with Bishop Soule, which was passed unanimously. Bishop S. stated to the Conference, that he had invited Bishop A. to meet him here to assist him in the discharge of his duties, and that he had named him, not as a friend, but as a colleague, *called to the full power and authority of the Episcopal office*, that he had done so in full view of his own personal responsibility, which he was fully prepared to meet.

THE VIRGINIA CONFERENCE acted with unanimity in favor of division, and appointed as delegates the following: Thomas Crowder, John E. Smith, William A. Smith, Leroy M. Lee, Henry B. Davis, David S. Doggett, Abram Penn and Anthony Daniels, as alternates, Lewis Skidmore and George W. Langhorne.

The anniversary of the Church St. Pauls Benevolent Society will be held next Sabbath evening (15th inst.) at the Church St. M. E. Church—services commencing at 7 o'clock. Addresses may be expected from Rev. A. Stevens, Rev. M. Rayner, and perhaps others. A collection will be taken in aid of the funds of the society.

Boston, Dec. 9.

ONE SUBJECT.—We still crowd our columns with the great controversy. Some of our correspondents wish us to get through with it quickly, others wish to follow it to without ceasing, as it is the great event, perhaps, in our history, and New England is in grave responsibilities. Meanwhile we keep clear of it more than most of our other papers, give our readers more than half the paper for miscellaneous reading, and intend to abridge the "one subject" within the limits as soon as possible, confining it mostly to news.

THE PLAN.—Dr. Tomlinson thus writes in the Western Christian Advocate about the plan of division:—"Now if this plan, not in a single case, expression merely, but in all the expressions made, and in the whole tenor of it, does not turn us out of the Methodist Episcopal Church, then I think we may fairly conclude, that there is no propriety in defining words to be the signs of ideas. And to say that it was not originally intended to have this effect, as I humbly conceive, to implicate, most seriously the discernment of the committee by whom it was drafted, and of the Conference by whom it was adopted: than whom, as I firmly believe, a more intelligent body of men never assembled in this country. No, they saw plainly that if they allowed the distinctive title of the denomination to be applied to the separating party, or allowed any modification of it for their benefit, it would vitiate all the legal instruments in which they are concerned; such as deeds of conveyance, acts of incorporation, &c. And, indeed, I have been informed to this effect by some of the delegates themselves. So that if we separate we must be known both by name and in fact as something distinct from the Methodist Episcopal Church. And this I am satisfied neither preachers nor people are prepared to let us not deceive ourselves in this matter. These resolutions, as authorized by this plan, is not a separation from the North merely, as some have supposed, but it is a separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church. And if we go off on any other plan without the previous sanction of the General Conference, our condition would, if possible, be still worse, no matter what name we might choose to call ourselves. And therefore, I would most respectfully say, *let us stay where we are*, and let us not, in seeking redress for an alleged injury, inflict upon ourselves a still greater injury."

DR. BANNING'S PATENT LACE, or Abdominal and Spinal Supporter.—This Lace is designed to relieve and cure abdominal, muscular and spinal weakness, dyspepsia, affections of the lungs, general prostrations, costiveness, weakness and sinking feelings in the stomach, all dragging and bearing down pains, &c., &c., in all which complaints it has given the highest satisfaction. Many of our preachers have found it an invaluable relief. Dr. Banning's original views of the causes of dyspepsia, bronchitis, &c., have excited much attention. Persons afflicted with muscular weakness of the abdomen or back, whose employment compels them to stand much, or speak in public, will find this instrument an admirable support and relief. The instances of cure in his late volume are astonishing. The instrument is recommended by some of our best physicians.

A. F. Bartlett, agent, No. 221 Washington, opposite Franklin street, Boston.

Mr. Torrey was convicted at Baltimore on Monday of aiding in the abduction of slaves; the jury found him guilty on all three of the indictments. His counsel gave notice that they would move for an arrest of judgment and a new trial.

No less than twenty-seven persons were convicted at Lowell last week of violating the license laws. So says a daily paper of this city. Intemperance is fearfully increasing among us. Drunkenness is opening all about our city, and yet we have men who would have the laws applied against all other crimes, crying out for forbearance to these worst depredators on the public morals and interests. The neglect of the laws in respect to these wretched criminals is bringing back again the flood of intemperance upon us. What is the city government doing?

Twenty-eight of sixty negroes who were manumitted in Illinois seventeen years ago, were set free from the Shawneetown jail on the 14th of Nov., when the writ was concluded. The spectators received the decision with great applause, and Judge Sears fined the warden of them \$5 each.

POETRY.

For Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal.

THE CATASTROPHE.

The beautiful night faded in the West;
On all a Sabbath stillness seemed to rest;
No din of wheels, no hum of busy feet,
But female forms to sigh and whisper meet.
There by the wayside sat an aged man,
His few and hoary locks proclaimed the span
Of life near its terminus; dim his eye—
His bosom heaved convulsive with a sigh.
The haunts where he in youth had loved to roam,
The hills and vales around his childhood's home—
And gentle ones who sported with him there,
Strangers to sorrow, free from every care,
Across the visioned field of memory flew—
Long ere this period had he bid adieu
To her whose seraph smile a halo shed
Along his way—above her lowly bed
The trembling foliage of the yew-tree spread.

He thought upon his sons, who promised fair,
The epilog with faithfulness to bear;
But deep their guilt, and God's avenging hand
In token of his wrath had smote the land.
Dark o'er their sky then hung the cloud of war,
And muffled thunders echoed from afar;
While lightning's fire athwart the horizon flash,
Contenting elements in confusion crash,
And in vain hope, the sacred ark they take,
That then omnipotence their cause would make
His own, and fight his battle to defend.

Here let the hypocrite behold his end;
Nor think beneath the liars of heaven,
Impunity to deeds of darkness given.
The cross, though symbol of a Savior's grace,
In sacred hands is made the mace
Of death, and where its peaceful banners wave,
Through taught to look and live—behold a grave!

Jehovah thunders—and empires melt away,
And none the thunder of his wrath can stay.
A soul may conquer with a little band,
Or vanquish flesh with hosts at his command.
Thus when the uncircumcised giant assailed
Jah's Goliath, their arms prevailed,
And victors shouting, from the field they bore,
What, most of all, the faithful would deplore.

His lips all colorless, as if to speak,
Half opened—down his thin and furrowed cheek
The big tear rolled—across his marble brow
A shade bespeaking sorrow spread, and now
He starts—his eyes—his hands—his face—
Trembling he takes his seat—across the plain
A storm-come—all gathered from afar,
To meet the herald from the scene of war—
"All, all is lost," he cried, and then despair
Sent forth his wail, that seemed to rend the air.
(The stricken warrior wept an only son,
And dotting sisters for a brother gone,
There orphan helplessness first felt the blast,
That leaves a cheerless wilderness when past—
Where hope the bright beacon far had gleamed,
With withering flowers in memory of the dead—
And hymn's latest verses gather now
Around the grave, in widowhood to bow)

Such are thy deeds, war, blackest son of hell,
The atmosphere of sighs thou lovest well;
Thou drinkest greedily at the fount of tears—
And sportest with the choicest fruit of years—
Of all the strains that floods or angels hear,
Grains are the most delightful to thine ear.
"What meanest thou," he said, and drawing near,
These words of painful truth fell on his ear,
"Before our foes the bravest hearts have fled,
Thy sons Hephai, and Phineas too, are dead,
The Ark of God is gone—be heard no more—
But fell, smitten to death with tidings sore—
His people slaves—the tabernacle lost—
And loved ones dead—O what had life to boast!
The winter, joyless, sunless winter draw,
To weep when none in sympathy draw near,
To utter farewells till we stand alone,
And to the unresponsive, sigh, "They're gone!"

Columbia. F. A. CRAFTS.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

MISS HANNAH P., daughter of Mr. Jonathan and Ruth Treadwell, of Hiram, Me., and consort of Mr. William W. Fairbanks, of Rumford, Me., died Nov. 20, 1844, aged 29 years. She was supported till the last by that religion which gives the assurance of a blessed immortality. She possessed an amiable disposition and uniform and unassuming piety, and was a worthy member of the M. E. Church, and lived beloved by all that knew her, and died lamented. The solemn occasion was improved by the writer of this notice, as "Thus saith the Lord, set thy house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live;" after which the remains of our sister were followed to the grave by a large circle of friends, and laid by the side of her two babes, there to rest till the resurrection.

JONATHAN FAIRBANKS.

FLORELLA AMANDA, from Monticello, Howard Co., Md., daughter of Rev. Isaac S. House, and grand-daughter of Rev. Elisha House, of Mich., and Rev. Isaac Scarratt, of Illinois, died in New Bedford, in her 15th year. Her house came from Mo. last year, and finding his health improving, received an appointment in this place, and sister H. returned to bring her two daughters. She found the eldest far gone in a pulmonary consumption. By her physician's advice she set off with her afflicted child, who suffered much during a journey of nearly two thousand miles. She had given up the hope of life, and resigned all into the hands of her Savior, but greatly desired to see her father once more. He met them at Pittsburgh, and arrived here Oct. 22d. She was calm and patient through all, and sank peacefully into the arms of death on the 29th, in hope of a glorious resurrection. Many attended her funeral, to whom I spoke on 1 Cor. xv. 56-7, with uncommon sensations, as it called to mind the scenes of former years. I knew her paternal grandfather near forty years ago, and received her maternal grandfather and mother into the church thirty-eight years ago. Now this tender branch has come all this way to slumber in our soil until the trumpet shall sound. May we all be ready to meet our Lord in peace.

New Bedford, Nov. 22, 1844. A. KENT.

N. B. Will the Western Christian Advocate please copy.

MRS. HANNAH SHAW, died in Brewer, Me., Sept. 18, aged 66. Sister Shaw experienced religion forty-four years ago, and closely followed her Savior during the most of her long pilgrimage. She was uniform in her devotion and piety, consistent in her example, ever manifesting in an eminent degree the character of a Christian. She was patient in suffering, yet often desired to depart and be with Christ, looking with joyful prospect for the hour of her release, knowing that though to live was Christ, yet to die was gain. Well may her pious friends mourn the loss of her society and counsel, yet they rejoice in the prospect of meeting her above. Praise God. S. H. BEALE.

Brewer, Nov. 27, 1844. -

P. S. Will the Morning Star please insert the above and oblige numerous friends.

PETER WELLS, son of Br. Henry Wells, died at Bristol, N. H., Oct. 2, in the nineteenth year of his age. A brief sickness removed him from health and activity to the silence of the tomb. He embraced the Savior at the early age of eleven years, in a revival under the ministerial labors of Rev. James Dow. He did not, however, make a public profession of religion until about three years since, when he united with the M. E. Church. In the early part of his sickness he complained that he was destitute of the evidence he desired of his acceptance with God. But after lifting his soul to God in prayer for the light of his reconciled countenance, his mind was filled with great peace and joy, and he often praised the Lord aloud for the manifestations of his grace.

Bristol, Nov. 13, 1844. N. W. ASPENWALL.

HENRY W., son of Joseph Collins, of Seabrook, N. H., died Oct. 31, twelve days out from Wilmington, N. C., aged 22 years. It was expected by his anxious friends that on his arrival at Boston, he would have visited them in an absence of nearly three years, but God saw it to be best to have it otherwise, and instead of the embrace of parents, brothers and sisters, he has fallen into the embrace of death, and his body rests in a watery grave. His deeply afflicted friends have it to comfort them, that in his last days he prayed and entertained hopes of acceptance with God.

HENRY BROWN, Jr., of Seabrook, died Nov. 18, aged 19 years. He came to his death by the accidental discharge of a gun lodging its contents in the cords of his leg, directly under the knee joint. He lingered a few weeks in the hope of recovering, but it proved fatal. His sufferings were extreme, but through the efforts of his pious physician, he was happily converted to God some thirty-six hours before his death, and died triumphantly. He had his reason perfectly to the end. May his faithful warnings and this solemn providence be sanctified to the good of his deeply afflicted friends.

NANCY DOW, of Seabrook, died Nov. 19, aged about 62. She had been a great sufferer for many months, but died in great peace.

L. D. BLODGETT.

Seabrook, N. H., Dec. 2, 1844.

MRS. NANCY, wife of Mr. Josiah L. Newcomb, and daughter of Mr. Levi Snow, died of consumption in Mansfield, Nov. 18, aged 26 years. She was converted about five years ago, and joined the M. E. Church. She was an affectionate wife, a kind neighbor, and universally loved and respected by all who knew her. Her life was that of an humble and consistent Christian. She was patient in her sickness and triumphant in her death. The glory that filled her soul often burst from her lips in expressions of joy and praise. After taking leave of her friends and relatives who gathered around her dying bed, she attempted to join with them in singing the praise of God. But from earth she has gone to sing in glory. A. G. BOWLES.

Mansfield, Dec. 2, 1844.

SISTER ALMIRA, second wife of Col. J. W. Jameson, died in Windsor, Me., Oct. 19, 1844, of lingering consumption, aged 43 years. Sister Jameson experienced religion in early life, and joined the M. E. Church in 1823. She was a devoted wife, a kind mother, and a faithful member of the church. In her last sickness, her faith was firm and unshaken, and she died as she had lived, a Christian. Her loss is severely felt by her bereaved husband, and numerous family of children, and other relatives, and also by the church and neighborhood, for she was universally esteemed and beloved. She has gone to that blessed land where all is joy, and may we copy her virtues that we may meet her reward. MOSES DONNELLY.

Windsor, Nov. 26, 1844.

MRS. DINAH ADAMS died in West Tisbury, Oct. 13, aged 80 years. Twenty years since our beloved sister Adams sought and obtained the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. In 1823 she united with the M. E. Church in this place. Since that time she has lived an exemplary member. Death came sudden but it found her ready. She resignedly left her place in the church militant for a seat in the church triumphant. Many dear friends left behind follow her as she followed Christ, and at last meet her in heaven. GEO. W. WOODING.

Columbia. F. A. CRAFTS.

CHILD'S DEPARTMENT.

For Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal.

MARY LOUISA PAINE.

BROTHER STEVENS—Presuming some account of Mary Louisa, infant daughter of John T. and Mary E. R. Paine, of Sanford, Me., who departed this life November 1st, aged two years and ten months, might be interesting, especially to the juvenile readers of the Herald, I forward the following for publication.

MARY L. Paine was a most lovely and interesting child. Beautiful in person, precocious in mind, and remarkably sweet and mature in the disposition of her heart.

She was unusually affectionate. Though the warmth of her affection was more fully seen in her uncommon attachment to the members of her own family, yet her affectionate regards seemed to be limited only by the extent of her acquaintance. An elderly lady, a near neighbor, who was confined to her room by sickness, was a subject of Mary's solicitude and regard. Every day when the weather would allow of her going out, this little "angel of mercy" might be seen pursuing her way to the sick room of "grand-mamma," as she called her, seldom stopping by the way until she came to the bedside of the object of her solicitude; and when there could be satisfied only in being permitted to sit upon the bed and converse with her. Generally, before leaving home she would ask her mother to give her some leaves of plants, or something else, to carry to the sick lady, and would offer as a reason, that "grand-mamma is sick all the time." And whenever her mother was disposed to put her off, she would urge her request by telling her mother how much she pined her. One day she wanted a book to carry to her, to read, and appeared much delighted when it was given to her. When this lady died, Mary appeared very solemn, and remarked "It is a pity that grand-mamma should be buried in the ground." But being told that she was a good woman, and had gone to dwell with God, she never afterward said she was sorry that she was dead, but would say, "I shall go to heaven too, if I am good." And every time she was asked, "What will you do when you die?" she would say, "I shall go to heaven too, if I am good." And every time she was asked, "What will you do when you die?" she would say, "I shall go to heaven too, if I am good."

Almost as soon as she began to talk she manifested a disposition to converse about God, and heaven, and things of a serious nature; and would frequently introduce such subjects of her own accord; making such inquiries as were truly wonderful for such a comparative infant as she then was. During the last fortnight of her life she was once heard to say, "I am going to God," and once being inquired of, why she said so, and if any one had been saying so to her; she said there had not. The day before she died, when apparently in perfect health, she said, "Mamma, I shall die, but will God ever die?" Her mother inquired, "Why do you ask, Mary?" "Because," said she, "I am going to God, and I want you and papa to go too," and then mumbled some, if not all, the other members of the family. Though but the wish of a comparative infant, yet how important, how desirable—an unbroken family in heaven! That this may be realized, is the prayer of many a sympathizing friend. On the first day of the present month, after a short but severe illness, she left the embrace of a most affectionate family, to repose in the bosom of him who said, "Suffer little children to come to me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God."

M. PALMER.

Spring Vale, Nov. 27, 1844.

THE SULK.

This is the name of a disease which is not uncommon among children. Though some grow up without being much afflicted with it, yet I have seen a child so entirely under its influence as to throw herself upon the floor, kick over benches and chairs, and seem ready to bite and devour every thing in her way.

Some children, from their habits and circumstances, are much more likely to have this disease than others. Those that generally have their own way about every thing, and whose parents let them play in the streets or by the road side, when they please, and with whom they please—such children are very much exposed to have the sulk. I have seen children suffering with it, however, who had the kindest parents and happiest home that children can have.

My object is to describe to our readers the appearances of the disease, and the consequences of it, and some of the best remedies that can be used.

It generally comes on when something is said or done that we do not like. For instance, Jane Barber came home from school the other day with a green apple, which Susan Carp had given her. Like a good girl, she went directly to her mother with it, and by her mother she was told to throw it right away. Jane began to cry. "Why, mother, I won't hurt me! all the girls eat them, and they are not hurt."

"My dear," said her mother, "I tell you to throw it away, and you must do it. I am the best judge what is fit for you to do."

Then came on a fit of the sulk. First she threw out one of her elbows, and then the other, and then both at once. Then her shoulders began to twist, first one way, then the other. Her head began to go forward and backward with a jerk, and she stamped, when she walked away, as if she was trying to get a tight shoe on.

"Go and sit down, Jane, in that chair until dinner-time," said Mrs. Barber.

This made the disease worse. She began to make a wailing, fretful noise with her mouth; and soon her feet began to swing back and forth against the chair; and then she began to push her chair against the wall. Her hair was hanging over her eyes, which were now swollen and red with weeping; and so great was the change in her appearance in less than half an hour, that you would hardly have known her. This is a fair statement of the appearance of the disease in Jane Barber's case. Sometimes these appearances are different. The corner of the apron is crowded into the mouth and cheeks; the fingers are twisted one over the other; the work, or plaything, or book, is thrown down upon the floor, or across the room; and the eyes snap and stare about like a person who is mad. The afflicted child kicks, and strikes, and screams; and it is sometimes necessary to catch her, and confine her, even as we would a wild animal. In such violent attacks as these, it is necessary to apply the severest remedy immediately, or the patient will soon be past all hope of recovery.

The remedies which are useful for this dreadful disease are various; but there is only one which is certain to cure. As it is brought on by discontent, disobedience, and selfishness, the first thing is to try to change these into contentment, obedience, and love. Sometimes a smart use of the rod will drive away the disease for a time; and perhaps going to school without dinner, or going to bed without supper or a kiss, may have a good effect. But as the disease begins in the heart (Matt. xv. 10), the cure must begin there too. And as soon as the heart is right, the disease will disappear entirely.

In common disease it is not always easy to decide what physician to employ, what medicine to use. Some pretend to great skill in the cure of particular diseases, and almost every disease has some certain cure, if we believe what the advertisements say about it. But for all diseases of the temper (and the sulk among the rest, there is only one infallible physician, and one certain cure. Christ alone gives a new heart, and with it a new temper. His grace cures the most stubborn disease, if he is properly applied to with a true and earnest desire for cure, and we must be willing to follow the directions he gives. They are all printed, and may be read by any one. And what is more than all, the advice and medicine may be had by the poor as well as the rich; by the young as well as the old; by all alike, without money and without price.—YOUTH'S FRIEND.

For Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal.

TO REV. G. F. COX.

"Every man's word shall be made manifest. If any man's deed shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss."—1 Cor. iii. 10-12.

Dear Brother,—The position you have occupied before the public in connection with the "Second Advent movement," and the silence you are now maintaining in regard to it, have (in view of recent developments) suggested the propriety of making you, in this form, a friendly communication. You will do me the justice to believe, that no feeling of individual alienation, of social disruption, of popular and calumnious agitation, immediately and legitimately resulting; but those consequences dwindle into trifles compared with those now being developed, and traceable to the same source. Alas! what state has the body of Jesus received in the house of his friends! How many have been betrayed into a renunciation and denunciation of the church and the ministry; nay, to an utter rejection of religion and the Bible; nay, more, an abandonment of Millierite lecturing, of lunatic asylums, of shunshouses, of divided, desolate churches, impoverished and forsaken families, of foul and scandalous apostasies testify. This is no fancy picture; would that it were; but the facts are known and read of all men. Will you allege that you are not responsible for these excesses, or that they are not the legitimate results of the Millierite heresy? I cannot think you have so far lost your reasoning powers as not to be susceptible to conviction to the contrary. If you unqualifiedly endorse the theory of Wm. Miller you will not deny, and to some, at least, it appears equally plain that by that endorsement you become responsible for the influence that was calculated to exert on community. Had it proved true, you would have rejoiced that you were enabled to assume so lofty a position before a scoffing world. But it has proved false, dreadfully false, and now you would doubtless gladly persuade yourself that you have not been accessory to the scandal and mischief that have accrued from it.—Else why this silence, when the sad results of your unfortunate teaching are so fearfully multiplying around you? Perhaps you will say, "I have made an apology." True; but are you satisfied with that apology? I believe you were not understood in the "apology" to give up anything in Millierism but "the witness of the spirit to the fact that the world would end in 1843." And can you do nothing more to counteract the direful effect of these "able essays" in the cause of error? Surely, my brother, it becomes you to go over this matter again. I should feel that you had cause to be grieved with me were I to allege that you had yet to be convinced of the falsity of Millierism, and yet your silence under existing circumstances

would seem to justify such an assumption. Do you ask, "What ought I to do?" Let your own sense of propriety and duty dictate. But O, do something to manifest publicly your deep regret and sorrow for the unhappy course into which you have been betrayed; something that will show that you deeply sympathize with the church in the distractions and afflictions she is suffering from the late false excitement, and earnestly desire to do all in your power to "heal the hurt of the daughter Zion," something that may serve to lead those who have followed blind guides, who have left the church and denounced her as Babylon, left their families and their business, to repent and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, by becoming so "little children," "esteeming others better than themselves," being "diligent in business," "providing for their own households," paying their honest debts, "inquiring for the old paths and walking therein." Such a position, it does appear to me, my brother, at this time becomes Rev. G. F. Cox. It is perfectly idle to think of escaping your awful responsibility in this matter by preserving silence. The eyes of the public, of the pious in all the churches are turned toward the leaders in this movement, and the questions are beginning to be raised, "Are they honest? are they sincere? are they rational or of a sane mind?" I have never allowed myself for a moment to harbor a doubt of your sincerity or piety in this matter. There are few men for whose opinions I have had a greater respect, and few Methodist preachers I have more ardently loved than yourself. You cannot but be sensible that this affliction and confidence were common to a large number of Methodist preachers and a still greater number of our people, and that just in proportion as they were cherished, the stability and peace of the church were jeopardized. What gratitude do we not owe to God, that we were kept from following in your footsteps! Many of us with less discrimination and piety than I sincerely accord to you, had now been where some of the once zealous devotees of Millierism now are, drifting in the gulf stream of skepticism and infidelity, or worse than these appearances are different. The corner of the apron is crowded into the mouth and cheeks; the fingers are twisted one over the other; the work, or plaything, or book, is thrown down upon the floor, or across the room; and the eyes snap and stare about like a person who is mad. The afflicted child kicks, and strikes, and screams; and it is sometimes necessary to catch her, and confine her, even as we would a wild animal. In such violent attacks as these, it is necessary to apply the severest remedy immediately, or the patient will soon be past all hope of recovery.

The Duke of Richmond had given notice of an address to the throne against the further prosecution of hostilities with America. Chatham had, during some time, absented himself from Parliament, in consequence of his growing infirmities. He determined to appear in his place on this occasion, and to declare that his opinions were decidedly at variance with those of the Rockingham party. He was in a state of great excitement. His medical attendants were uneasy, and strongly advised him to calm himself, and to remain at home. But he was not to be controlled. His son, William, and his son-in-law Lord Mahon, accompanied him to Westminster. He rested himself in the Chamberlain's room till the debate commenced, and then, leaning on his two young relatives, hurried to his seat. The slightest particulars of that day were remembered, and have been carefully recorded.—He bowed, it was remarked, with great courtesies to those peers who rose to make way for him and his supporters. His crutch was in his hand. He wore, as was the fashion, a rich velvet coat. His legs were swathed in flannel. His wig was so large, and his face so emaciated, that none of his features could be discerned except the high curve of nose, and his eyes, which still retained a gleam of the old fire.

When the Duke of Richmond had spoken, Chatham rose. For some time his voice was inaudible. At length his tones became distinct and his action animated. Here and there his hearers caught a thought or an expression which reminded them of William Pitt. But it was clear that he was not himself. He lost the thread of his discourse, hesitated, repeated the same words several times, and was so confused in the speaking of the Act of Settlement, that he could not recall the name of the Electress Sophia. The House listened in solemn silence, and with the aspect of profound respect and compassion. The stillness was so deep that the dropping of a handkerchief would have been heard. The Duke of Richmond replied with great tenderness and courtesy; but, while he spoke, the old man was observed to be restless and irritable.—The Duke sat down. Chatham stood up again, pressed his hand on his breast, and sank down in an apoplectic fit. Three or four lords who sat near him caught him in his fall. The House broke up in confusion. The dying man was carried to the residence of one of the officers of Parliament, and was so far restored as to be able to bear a journey to Hayes. At Hayes, after lingering a few weeks, he expired in his seventieth year. His bed was watched to the last, with anxious tenderness, by his wife and children; and he well deserved their care. Too often haughty and wayward to others, to them he had been almost effeminately kind. He had through life been drenched by his political opponents, and regarded with more awe than love even by his political associates. But no fear seems to have mingled with the affection which his fondness, constantly overflowing in a thousand forms, had inspired in the little circle at Hayes.

Chatham, at the time of his decease, had not, in both Houses of Parliament, ten personal adherents. Half the public men of the age had been estranged from him by his errors, and the other half by the exertions which he had made to repair his errors. His last speech had been an attack at once on the policy recommended by the government, and on the policy recommended by the opposition. But death at once restored him to his old place in the affection of his country. Who could hear unmoved of the fall of that which had been so great, and which had stood so long? The circumstances, too, seemed rather to belong to the tragic than to the heroic life. A great statesman, full of years and real hopes, and stricken down in full council while striving his feeble voice to rouse the drooping spirit of his country, could not but be remembered with peculiar veneration and tenderness. Detraction was overruled. The voice even of just and temperate censure was mute. Nothing was remembered but the lofty genius, the unsullied probity, the undimmed services of him who was no more. For once all parties were agreed. A public funeral, a public monument, were eagerly voted. The debts of the deceased were paid. A provision was made for his family. The city of London requested that the remains of the great man whom she had so long loved and honored, might rest under the dome of her magnificent cathedral. But the petition came too late. Every thing was already prepared for the interment in Westminster Abbey.

Though men of all parties had concurred in decreeing posthumous honors to Chatham, his corpse was attended to the grave almost exclusively by opponents of the government. The banner of the lordship of Chatham was borne by Colonel Barre, attended by the Duke of Richmond, and Lord Rockingham, Burke, Saville, and Dunning upon the pall. Lord Camden was conspicuous in the procession. The chief mourner was young William Pitt.

After the lapse of more than twenty-seven years, in a season as dark and perilous, his own shattered frame and broken heart were laid, with the same pomp, in the same consecrated mould. Chatham sleeps near the northern door of the church, in a spot which has ever since been appropriated to statesmen, as the other end of the transept has long been to poets. Mansfield rests there, and the second William Pitt, and Fox, and Grattan, and Canning and Wilberforce. In no other cemetery do so many great citizens lie within so narrow a space. High over those venerable graves, towers the stately monument of Chatham, and from above, his own edify, graven by a cunning hand, seems still, with eagle face and outstretched arm, to bid England be of good cheer, and to hurl defiance at her foes. The generation which reared that memorial of him has disappeared. The time has come when the rash and indiscriminate judgments which his contemporaries passed on his character may be calmly revised by history. And history, while for the warning of vehement, high and daring natures, she notes his many errors, will yet deliberately pronounce, that among the eminent men whose bones lie near his, scarcely one has left a more stainless, and none a more splendid name.—Macaulay in the Edinburgh Review.

Southampton was the birth place of Dr. Watts. And it was for a congregation of Independents (Congregationalists) that his inimitable psalms and hymns were first composed. This congregation has existed here since the time of Charles II. It is now greatly increased, and appears to be highly prosperous. It has a new and beautiful house of worship, which will seat 12 or 1400 persons. Recently the chapel there are commodious school-rooms. The church has under its care eight Sunday schools in the town and different villages around, in which nearly 800 children are instructed. A sort of circulating library of books in theology and other useful knowledge, is connected with the chapel—altogether indicating a degree of energy in the Society, and a desire to be useful, together with corresponding prosperity, which are extremely interesting and encouraging in a country like this, where a love of lifeless forms and empty ceremonies is so prevalent.

The neighborhood of Southampton was a favorite resort of the poet Cowper, who spent many of his early days here. At a short distance from the town, in the church of Millbrook, lie the remains of the celebrated Robert Pollok, author of "The Course of Time." In plain sight is the "New Forest," once the most extensive and interesting royal hunting grounds in the kingdom. It is nearly fifty miles in extent. It was set apart by William the Conqueror, or, as some English historians choose to call him, William the First; and for many years was the favorite resort of those English monarchs who were attached to the pleasures of the chase. In the midst of this immense forest stands a stone, which is said to mark the place where Edward, surnamed Rufus, received his death wound: from the glancing of an arrow, shot by one of his attendants at a passing stag.

THE CLOSING SCENES IN THE LIFE OF LORD CHATHAM.

THE Duke of Richmond had given notice of an address to the throne against the further prosecution of hostilities with America. Chatham had, during some time, absented himself from Parliament, in consequence of his growing infirmities. He determined to appear in his place on this occasion, and to declare that his opinions were decidedly at variance with those of the Rockingham party. He was in a state of great excitement. His medical attendants were uneasy, and strongly advised him to calm himself, and to remain at home. But he was not to be controlled. His son, William, and his son-in-law Lord Mahon, accompanied him to Westminster. He rested himself in the Chamberlain's room till the debate commenced, and then, leaning on his two young relatives, hurried to his seat. The slightest particulars of that day were remembered, and have been carefully recorded.—He bowed, it was remarked, with great courtesies to those peers who rose to make way for him and his supporters. His crutch was in his hand. He wore, as was the fashion, a rich velvet coat. His legs were swathed in flannel. His wig was so large, and his face so emaciated, that none of his features could be discerned except the high curve of nose, and his eyes, which still retained a gleam of the old fire.

When the Duke of Richmond had spoken, Chatham rose. For some time his voice was inaudible. At length his tones became distinct and his action animated. Here and there his hearers caught a thought or an expression which reminded them of William Pitt. But it was clear that he was not himself. He lost the thread of his discourse, hesitated, repeated the same words several times, and was so confused in the speaking of the Act of Settlement, that he could not recall the name of the Electress Sophia. The House listened in solemn silence, and with the aspect of profound respect and compassion. The stillness was so deep that the dropping of a handkerchief would have been heard. The Duke of Richmond replied with great tenderness and courtesy; but, while he spoke, the old man was observed to be restless and irritable.—The Duke sat down. Chatham stood up again, pressed his hand on his breast, and sank down in an apoplectic fit. Three or four lords who sat near him caught him in his fall. The House broke up in confusion. The dying man was carried to the residence of one of the officers of Parliament, and was so far restored as to be able to bear a journey to Hayes. At Hayes, after lingering a few weeks, he expired in his seventieth year. His bed was watched to the last, with anxious tenderness, by his wife and children; and he well deserved their care. Too often haughty and wayward to others, to them he had been almost effeminately kind. He had through life been drenched by his political opponents, and regarded with more awe than love even by his political associates. But no fear seems to have mingled with the affection which his fondness, constantly overflowing in a thousand forms, had inspired in the little circle at Hayes.

Chatham, at the time of his decease, had not, in both Houses of Parliament, ten personal adherents. Half the public men of the age had been estranged from him by his errors, and the other half by the exertions which he had made to repair his errors. His last speech had been an attack at once on the policy recommended by the government, and on the policy recommended by the opposition. But death at once restored him to his old place in the affection of his country. Who could hear unmoved of the fall of that which had been so great, and which had stood so long? The circumstances, too, seemed rather to belong to the tragic than to the heroic life. A great statesman, full of years and real hopes, and stricken down in full council while striving his feeble voice to rouse the drooping spirit of his country, could not but be remembered with peculiar veneration and tenderness. Detraction was overruled. The voice even of just and temperate censure was mute. Nothing was remembered but the lofty genius, the unsullied probity, the undimmed services of him who was no more. For once all parties were agreed. A public funeral, a public monument, were eagerly voted. The debts of the deceased were paid. A provision was made for his family. The city of London requested that the remains of the great man whom she had so long loved and honored, might rest under the dome of her magnificent cathedral. But the petition came too late. Every thing was already prepared for the interment in Westminster Abbey.

Though men of all parties had concurred in decreeing posthumous honors to Chatham, his corpse was attended to the grave almost exclusively by opponents of the government. The banner of the lordship of Chatham was borne by Colonel Barre, attended by the Duke of Richmond, and Lord Rockingham, Burke, Saville, and Dunning upon the pall. Lord Camden was conspicuous in the procession. The chief mourner was young William Pitt.

After the lapse of more than twenty-seven years, in a season as dark and perilous, his own shattered frame and broken heart were laid, with the same pomp, in the same consecrated mould. Chatham sleeps near the northern door of the church, in a spot which has ever since been appropriated to statesmen, as the other end of the transept has long been to poets. Mansfield rests there, and the second William Pitt, and Fox, and Grattan, and Canning and Wilberforce. In no other cemetery do so many great citizens lie within so narrow a space. High over those venerable graves, towers the stately monument of Chatham, and from above, his own edify, graven by a cunning hand, seems still, with eagle face and outstretched arm, to bid England be of good cheer, and to hurl defiance at her foes. The generation which reared that memorial of him has disappeared. The time has come when the rash and indiscriminate judgments which his contemporaries passed on his character may be calmly revised by history. And history, while for the warning of vehement, high and daring natures, she notes his many errors, will yet deliberately pronounce, that among the eminent men whose bones lie near his, scarcely one has left a more stainless, and none a more splendid name.—Macaulay in the Edinburgh Review.

A TIDY WIFE IN A LIBRARY.

The following extract which is from an article in Tait's Magazine, would seem to show that the bump of order is developed differently on the masculine and feminine head. An orderly man arranges his book-shelf, putting the works of one kind, or treating of one subject, together. He goes away, contented with the idea, that now no effort of memory will be required to know where a particular book is, amongst a few hundreds of volumes, and no useless time will be expended in seeking, when he shall have forgotten the place of each individual work. He has only to know the subject of the work in question, and by this is guided to its place. Now comes his tidy wife. The books of one size are set together; little ones at the top, and great ones at the bottom. The prayer book cannot be by the Bible—it is too little; it must go along with an annual and pocket dictionary, on to the top shelf. An atlas and a book of designing, must stand by the Bible, because her bump of tidiness (order run mad) has found, or fancied, a connection between them. There is nothing this mad woman won't do. The excellent arrangement of a dictionary, by means of which one particular word may be found in a minute, amongst many thousands, would be changed by her obedience to a favorite saw, "Little ones at the top, and great ones at the bottom;" and if any one complained they could not find what they wanted, she would answer, "You should remember where you put it; You ought to be able to go to it in the dark;" &c. &c.

Pitt. After the lapse of more than twenty-seven years, in a season as dark and perilous, his own shattered frame and broken heart were laid, with the same pomp, in the same consecrated mould. Chatham sleeps near the northern door of the church, in a spot which has ever since been appropriated to statesmen, as the other end of the transept has long been to poets. Mansfield rests there, and the second William Pitt, and Fox, and Grattan, and Canning and Wilberforce. In no other cemetery do so many great citizens lie within so narrow a space. High over those venerable graves, towers the stately monument of Chatham, and from above, his own edify, graven by a cunning hand, seems still, with eagle face and outstretched arm, to bid England be of good cheer, and to hurl defiance at her foes. The generation which reared that memorial of him has disappeared. The time has come when the rash and indiscriminate judgments which his contemporaries passed on his character may be calmly revised by history. And history, while for the warning of vehement, high and daring natures, she notes his many errors, will yet deliberately pronounce, that among the eminent men whose bones lie near his, scarcely one has left a more stainless, and none a more splendid name.—Macaulay in the Edinburgh Review.

Southampton was the birth place of Dr. Watts. And it was for a congregation of Independents (Congregationalists) that his inimitable psalms and hymns were first composed. This congregation has existed here since the time of Charles II. It is now greatly increased, and appears to be highly prosperous. It has a new and beautiful house of worship, which will seat 12 or 1400 persons. Recently the chapel there are commodious school-rooms. The church has under its care eight Sunday schools in the town and different villages around, in which nearly 800 children are instructed. A sort of circulating library of books in theology and other useful knowledge, is connected with the chapel—altogether indicating a degree of energy in the Society, and a desire to be useful, together with corresponding prosperity, which are extremely interesting and encouraging in a country like this, where a love of lifeless forms and empty ceremonies is so prevalent.

The neighborhood of Southampton was a favorite resort of the poet Cowper, who spent many of his early days here. At a short distance from the town, in the church of Millbrook, lie the remains of the celebrated Robert Pollok, author of "The Course of Time." In plain sight is the "New Forest," once the most extensive and interesting royal hunting grounds in the kingdom. It is nearly fifty miles in extent. It was set apart by William the Con